

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/719,007	11/20/2003	Randolph Mellus Johnson	DURE-007CON2	9101	
24353	7590 08/31/2006		INER		
BOZICEVIC, FIELD & FRANCIS LLP 1900 UNIVERSITY AVENUE SUITE 200 EAST PALO ALTO, CA 94303			GHALI, I	GHALI, ISIS A D	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			1615		
			DATE MAILED: 08/31/2006		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-326 (Rev. 1-04)

DETAILED ACTION

The receipt is acknowledged of applicants' IDS, request for RCE, and amendment, all filed 06/20/2006.

Claims 48-91 are pending and included in the prosecution.

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 06/20/2006 has been entered.

Double Patenting

2. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970);and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double

Art Unit: 1615

patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

3. Claims 48-91 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-36 of copending Application No. 11/044,521. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the instant claims are directed to method for providing analgesia by delivering fentanyl using a convective device that can be implanted (claim 58) and the conflicting claims of the copending application are directed to the same subject matter which is method for treating pain by delivering fentanyl using implanted device. The instantly claimed implantable convective device is a species for the generic implantable device for delivering fentanyl that claimed by copending application. Therefore the instant claims anticipate the generic implantable device claimed by the copending application.

This is a <u>provisional</u> obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicants requested that the provisional double patenting rejection to be held in abeyance until the subject rejection is the only one remaining in either the present application or in the 11/044,521 application.

Art Unit: 1615

The examiner acknowledges applicants' request, however, the "provisional" double patenting rejection should continue to be made by the examiner in each application as long as there are conflicting claims in more than one application unless that "provisional" double patenting rejection is the only rejection remaining in one of the applications.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 6. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Application/Control Number: 10/719,007

Art Unit: 1615

7. Claims 48-91 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over 5,057,318 ('318) combined with US 5,672,167 ('167).

US '318 teaches implantable osmotic drug delivery devices that can be highly loaded of beneficial agents and able to deliver active beneficial agents at a controlled rate continuously over time and over a broad range of dosage delivery rates according to predetermined time release pattern (abstract; col.3, lines 20-26, 30-34, 39-42; col.19, lines 27-30; col. 20, lines 20, 34). Example of the drugs suitable for delivery by the implantable osmotic device is analgesic (col.13, lines 60-61).

US '318 does not specifically teach fentanyl as the analgesic drug, or doses and periods of delivery, i.e. the patterned delivery regimen, as instantly claimed.

However, US '318 recognized highly loading of beneficial agents including analgesics and their delivery at a controlled rate continuously over time and over a broad range of dosage delivery rates according to predetermined time release pattern. This teaching would have motivated one having ordinary skill in the art to use the implantable osmotic device to deliver analgesics that need continuous delivery and manipulate the amount of analgesic and its period of delivery according to the specific patient need.

US '167 teaches osmotic drug delivery device that permits patients with certain medical conditions such as pain to have steady delivery rate of medication to achieve the desired therapeutic effects (abstract; col. 6, lines 31-36). The device enables therapy with highly potent drugs such as fentanyl. The reference teaches that the

Art Unit: 1615

volume of the drug and the total time to deliver this volume will vary depending on the drug (col.12, lines 49-65; col.13, line 5).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide implantable osmotic device to deliver analgesics at a controlled rate continuously over time and over a broad range of dosage delivery rates according to predetermined time release pattern as disclosed by US '318, and replace the analgesic with fentanyl as disclosed by US '167, motivated by the teaching of US '167 that osmotic devices are suitable for delivering highly potent analgesics such as fentanyl to permit patients with pain to have steady delivery rate to achieve the desired therapeutic effect, with reasonable expectation of having implantable osmotic device to deliver fentanyl that is highly loaded with fentanyl and able to deliver it at a controlled rate continuously over time and over a broad range of dosage delivery rates according to predetermined time release pattern with great success.

8. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. US 4,412,139 teaches osmotic device for controlled and continuous delivery of beneficial drug over a prolonged period of time to produce systemic effect. The device can be implanted. Analgesics can be delivered by this device.

Response to Arguments

Art Unit: 1615

9. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 48-91 have been considered but are

moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Isis Ghali whose telephone number is (571) 272-0595.

The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday, 7:00 to 5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Michael Woodward can be reached on (571) 272-8373. The fax phone

number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571)

273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Isis Ghali Examiner

Art Unit 1615

G '

AND AND EXAMINATED